UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,673	01/27/2004	Steven K. Ma	SVL920030110US1	3028

47069   7590   01/07/2010
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER
ENGLAND, SARA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krvuspto@ipmatters.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 October 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-10,33,34,36-44,46 and 48* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 7-10, 33-34, 36-44, 46 and 48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/9/09 has been entered.

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 33-34, 36-44, 46 and 48 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-4, 7-10, 33-34, 36-44, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle, US Patent 7216301, and further in view of Rochford et al., US Patent 6633312, hereinafter Rochford and further in view of Weber, US Patent 7370281.

As in Independent Claims 1, 31 and 40, Moehrle teaches a method for rendering a display of at a first and second data sets in a search panel (Fig. 4A, ref. 102), wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components (Fig. 4B, 10b-10d); receiving selection the displayed first data set name in the search panel (Col. 5, line 6)

displaying names of the file components associated with the first selected data set in

the search panel (Col. 5, lines 8-9); receiving selection of at least one of the displayed

file component names associated with the selected first data set (Fig. 4B, Selection of

ref. 50); rendering the selected data set name and the selected at least one selected file

component name in a history panel (Fig. 4C), wherein the selected data set name and

selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement

(Fig. 4B to 4C and corresponding text) and wherein the history panel and search panel

are rendered concurrently in a GUI (Fig. 5A-B). It can be seen from the teachings of

Moehrle that during the normal course of operation the user may initiate another search

by returning to a previous level and repeating the steps of opening a second data set

and selecting a second file component from the second data set and display a

hierarchical history of browsing in the panel (ie. top line).

However, Moehrle fails to explicitly teach rendering a history panel with the selected first

and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected

first and second data set names are displayed together in a hierarchical arrangement to

display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of

the selected data sets as recited in Claim 1. Rochford teaches a hierarchical file

accessing system with history tracking with the history panel and search panel are

rendered concurrently in the GUI (Fig. 2A and 8) similar to that of Moehrle. Rochford

further teaches rendering a history panel with the selected first and second data set

names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data

set names are displayed together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously

and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets (Fig. 8 and corresponding text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel taught by Moehrle to include the rendering a history panel simultaneously displaying the selected first and second data set names and associated selected file components of Rochford, in order to obtain selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because an ongoing history tracker useful for multiple searches would have been obtained, as taught by Rochford.

While Moehrle and Rochford teach selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names

and component file names of the selected data sets, they fail to explicitly show the file

components include source code files being accessed by a developer as recited in the

claims. In the same field of the invention, Weber teaches a file components including

source code accessing program similar to that of Moehrle and Rochford. In addition,

Weber further teaches the file components include source code files being accessed by

a developer (Fig. 1, ref. 2, 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford and Weber before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify the selection of a first data set name and corresponding

file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and

corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that

displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components

associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical

arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and

component file names of the selected data setstaught by Moehrle and Rochford to

include the file components to include source code of Weber, in order to obtain

selection of a two data set names and two corresponding file component names for

hierarchical display in a history panel, the file components include source code files

being accessed by a developer. One would have been motivated to make such a

combination because an Integrated Development Environment for user's frequently

used files would have been obtained, as taught by Weber.

As in Claims 2, 32 and 41, Moehrle teaches the data set name is displayed as a parent at a higher hierarchical level (Fig. 4B, 10a) to the file components (Fig. 4B, 10b-10d) associated with the displayed data set name (Fig. 4B, 101), wherein the file components are rendered as children in the history panel of the data set with which they are associated ("menu item 1.0 is the parent of menu items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4", Col. 3, lines 22-23). Rochford further teaches rendering a history panel with the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names are displayed together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets (Fig. 8 and corresponding text). Moehrle and Rochford have been combined for this reason as seen in the rejection of Claim 1.

As in Claims 3, 33 and 42, Moehrle teaches receiving one search qualifier (Fig. 7C); transmitting a request for data set names that satisfy the received at least one search qualifier (1.2.3.x), wherein the displayed data set names comprise data set names returned in response to the transmitted request whose name satisfies the at least one search qualifier (Col. 8, lines 36-39).

As in Claims 4, 34 and 43, Moehrle teaches transmitting a request for file component names of the selected data set name, wherein the displayed file component names comprise file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for file component names (Col. 9, lines 16-20).

As in Claims 7, 36 and 44, Moehrle and Rochford teach the steps of selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set,

selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the

second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second

data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and

second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and

currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets

(See Claim 1 rejected supra). While Moehrle and Rochford teaches selection of a first

data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a

second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set,

rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and

selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names

together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data

set names and component file names of the selected data sets, they fail to show the

source code files in different programming languages as recited in the claims. In the

same field of the invention, Weber teaches a file accessing program similar to that of

Moehrle and Rochford. In addition, Weber further teaches multilanguage documents of

source code that can be accessed and edited (Col. 2, lines 5 et seq.). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and

Rochford and Weber before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the

selection of two data set names and two corresponding file component names for

hierarchical display in a history panel taught by Moehrle and Rochford to include the

multilanguage documents of source code that can be accessed and edited of Weber, in

order to obtain selection of a two data set names and two corresponding file component

names for hierarchical display in a history panel the corresponding file components

comprising source code documents of different languages. One would have been

motivated to make such a combination because a unified interface for source code

editing would have been obtained, as taught by Weber.

As in Claims 8, 37 and 46, Moehrle teaches receiving user action with respect to

one selected data set name or file component name displayed in the history panel,

wherein the action specifies an operation to perform with respect to the selected data

set name or file component (when the user selects a level it creates a tab for that level

as seen in Fig. 5D).

As in Claim 9, 38 and 47, Moehrle teaches the operation is deleting the selected

data set or file component (Fig. 5D, 5E deletes previously selected 1.2.3.4).

As in Claims 10, 39 and 48, Moehrle and Rochford teach displaying content of

the selected file component in a panel (Fig. 5D bottom panel) displayed with the history

panel (top line) and the steps of selection of a first data set name and corresponding file

component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and

corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that

displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components

associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical

arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and

component file names of the selected data sets (See Claim 1 rejected supra). While

Moehrle and Rochford teaches selection of two data set names and two corresponding

file component names for hierarchical display in a history panel, displaying content of

the selected file component in a panel displayed with the history panel and suggests

and editing interface for the files (Fig. 6A) they fail to show the editing of the displayed

content as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, Weber teaches a file

accessing program similar to that of Moehrle and Rochford. In addition, Weber further

teaches editing of the displayed content (Fig. 2, ref. 4). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford and Weber

before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of a first data set

name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second

data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering

a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected

file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together

in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set

names and component file names of the selected data sets taught by Moehrle and

Rochford to include the editing of the displayed content of Weber, in order to obtain

selection of two data set names and two corresponding file component names for

simultaneous hierarchical tree display in a history panel, displaying content of the

selected file component in a panel displayed with the history panel and editing of the

displayed content. One would have been motivated to make such a combination

because a unified editing interface would have been obtained, as taught by Weber.

As in Claims 43 Moehrle and Rochford teach files being accessed by a developer

(user creating the active path) and steps of selection of a first data set name and

corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set

name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history

panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file

components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a

hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names

and component file names of the selected data sets (See Claim 1 rejected supra).

While Moehrle and Rochford teach selection of a first data set name and corresponding

file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and

corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that

displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components

associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical

arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and

component file names of the selected data sets, they fail to show the file components

include source code files as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention,

Weber teaches a file components including source code accessing program similar to

that of Moehrle and Rochford. In addition, Weber further teaches editing source code

files being accessed by a developer (Fig. 2, ref. 2, 4). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford and Weber

before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of a first data set

name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second

data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering

a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected

file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together

in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set

names and component file names of the selected data setstaught by Moehrle and

Rochford to include the file components to include source code of Weber, in order to

obtain selection of a two data set names and two corresponding file component names

for hierarchical display in a history panel, the file components include source code files

being accessed by a developer. One would have been motivated to make such a

combination because an Integrated Development Environment for user's frequently

used files would have been obtained, as taught by Weber.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/9/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Moehrle "does not teach or suggest rendering the selected data set name and a selected file component name in a search panel and history panel in a hierarchical tree arrangement", the examiner disagrees. Fig. 4a shows selecting a data set, and displaying that data set name and a file component within that data set name along the top line (history panel) and hierarchically (indented hierarchical names).

In response to applicant's argument that Moehrle does not teach "displaying a selected data set name and a file component name as claimed in a hierarchical tree" the examiner disagrees. Fig. 8 shows parent node ref. 212 and child nodes ref. 802.

The rejection above shows how both Moehrle and Rochford teach the added claim requirement that the history panel and search panel are displayed concurrently in a GUI window.

Applicant's arguments with respect to Arkhipov have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to

consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited

therein teach similar history panels and source code editing displays.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to SARA M. HANNE whose telephone number is (571)272-

4135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm, off on

alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, WEILUN LO can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sara M Hanne/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179